ABSTRACT
        Nouns are generally recalled and recognized better in
memory tasks, although several theoretical positions and a variety of
empirical tasks indicate the importance of verbs to sentences. To try
to resolve this paradox, several experiments were designed to explore
the efficiency of various sentence elements as cues in recognition
memory. Subjects for the experiments were students enrolled in an
introductory psychology course at Dartmouth College. In one
experiment concreteness of the stimuli did not interact with the type
of distractor; however, verb phrase changes were harder to recognize
than noun phrase changes when synonym distractors were used. This
result was replicated in two other experiments, a forced-choice
recognition paradigm and an experiment involving whole sentences
where the derivational similarity of verbs and nouns was controlled.
Two additional experiments indicated that the effect could not be
attributed to characteristics of the English language or to superior
memory for form information in nouns. The total results are
interpreted as suggesting that subjects process different parts of a
sentence to different semantic levels, with verbs receiving more
semantic representation and nouns more orthographic or phonological
representation. (Author/MKM)

Recognition Memory for Elements of Sentences

Allan G. Reynolds and Paul W. Flagg.

Dartmouth College

Hanover, N.H. 03755

Running head: Sentence Memory

Abstract

Although several theoretical positions and a variety of empirical tasks indicate the importance of verbs to sentences, nouns are generally recalled and recognized better in memorial tasks. Three main models can be identified to explain this discrepancy ("Fillenbaum's paradox"). To try to resolve this paradox, several experiments explored the efficiency of various sentence elements as cues in recognition memory. In Exp. 1, concreteness of the stimuli did not interact with the type of distractor; however, verb phrase changes were harder to recognize than noun phrase changes when synonym distractors were used. This result was replicated in a forced-choice recognition paradigm (Exp. 2) and with whole sentences where the derivational similarity of verbs and nouns was controlled (Exp. 4). The effect could not be attributed to characteristics of the English language (Exp. 3) or to superior memory for form information in nouns (Exp. 5). The total results are interpreted as suggesting that subjects process different parts of a sentence to different semantic levels, with verbs receiving more semantic representation and nouns more orthographic or phonological representation. The results are taken as support for a "Semantic Encoding Model" of Fillenbaum's paradox.

On intuitive grounds, it is generally felt that the verb carries a heavy burden for conveying meaning in a sentence. This common-sense observation is paralleled by several recent theoretical linguistic approaches emphasizing the importance of verbs. Chafe (1970), for example, has offered an entire utterance model based on the central role of verbs; in Chafe's approach, the verb is the semantic core of the sentence and other parts of speech derive their meaning from their relations to that verb.

Several psychological models of sentence processing also emphasize the role of verbs. As Wearing (1974) pointed out, the verb should be very important for surface structure models (Martin and Roberts, 1966; Yngve, 1960) of processing and memory because the placement of verbs directly affects the mean depth of a sentence; this variable has been shown to be important in a variety of tasks (Martin and Roberts, 1966; Wearing, 1970, 1972; Wearing and Crowder, 1971). Generative linguistic models (Fodor, Garrett, and Bever, 1968, p. 459) also view the verb as at least as important to deep structure as other parts of speech and it is well known that deep structural relations seem to be critical in certain memorial tasks (Blumenthal, 1967; Jarvella, 1971; Sachs, 1967; Townsend and Saltz, 1972; Weisberg, 1969).

1

4

A variety of researchers have shown empirically how
manipulations of verbs can influence sentence processing. The
effects of varying verb transitivity have been demonstrated by
Bacharach, Kellas, and McFarland (1972), Polzella and Rohrman
(1970), and Rohrman (1970); for complete sentence recall Thios
(1975) has shown that, when verbatim responses are used in a
cued-recall task, sentences with specific verbs are recalled
better than sentences with general verbs. Using a paired-
associate task with nouns as both stimuli and responses, Bower
(1970) has reported similar findings when subjects were
instructed to image a scene of two objects interacting in some
way or to image the two objects as independent entities in their
imagined space (for example, as pictures hanging on opposite
walls of a room). In a cued recognition test, the interactive
imagery subjects recalled 71% whereas the subjects in the other
condition recalled only 46% of the response terms. Thus, the
introduction of an action (i.e. verb) component enhanced
performance markedly. This may be because the verbs act as the
center point around which the other items can pivot.

The most impressive evidence for the primacy of verbs comes
from a variety of rating and sorting tasks. The importance of
verbs, as compared to other sentence elements, in judging
connotative meaning of sentences was reported by Gollub (1968),
and Heise (1969; 1970). Healy and Miller (1970) have also shown
the effects of verbs on judgments of denotative meaning; in their

study, verb similarity was the single variable most predictive of
overall sentence similarity. In the same vein, Healy and Miller
(1971) found that removing a verb from a sentence has graver
effects on the sentence's grammatical acceptability than the
removal of a noun.

Similar evidence on the importance of the verb with regard
to sentence meaning comes from a study by Gladney and Krulee
(1967). These authors were interested in the perception of
errors in simple sentences. To produce errors in a sentence,
they replaced the subject, object or verb with an adjective or an
adverb. The subjects' viewing time in perceiving these altered
sentences indicated that changes in the verb were more
disruptive than a change in either noun, regardless of whether
the substitution was an adjective or an adverb.. Horowitz and
Prytulak (1969) argued, since this finding is counter to their
position which stresses the importance of nouns, that one cannot
make a clear interpretation of this effect since the verb changes
resulted in a greater error rate than the noun changes. To use
their example: "The foreigner lonesome the speech of the visitor"
(verb change) is clearly more anomalous than "The drunken timidly
told them a ridiculous anecdote" (noun change). However, this is
just the effect one would expect if the verb is indeed more
central to the meaning of a sentence than are nouns.

Healy and Miller (1970) proposed a theatrical metaphor to
describe the roles of verbs and nouns in sentences: "the main

verb of a sentence defines the plot; the subject merely indicates
one of the actors" (p. 371). However, it appears that when
subjects know that they must remember something about the play
(sentence), it is the actors (nouns) that are remembered, rather
than the plot (verb). Contrasting sharply with the above
theoretical and empirical support for the primacy of verbs is a
wealth of evidence derived from memorial tasks indicating the
striking inferiority of verbs in recognition, recall, and cueing
tasks. For example, Wearing (1970) found verb recall to be
inferior to agent and object recall after both 30 sec and 48 hr
delays; verbs were also less powerful recall cues. Horowitz and
Prytulak (1969) and James (1972) have presented similar results.
Using recall tasks, Martin, Roberts, and Collins (1968) and
Martin and Walter (1969) have also found generally poorer recall
of verbs. Kintsch (1974, Ch. 7, Exps. 1 and 2) extended and
qualified the general findings that verbs are recalled poorer
than subjects or objects. For all simple subject-verb-object
sentences used, as well as more complex active sentences
involving indirect objects, the expected findings obtained.
However, for two of the five sentence types which involved
multiple semantic propositions, recall of the verb was
intermediate between that of the subject and object. As well,
one sentence type (a subject-verb-object-indirect object sentence
in the passive) gave superior recall for the verb. These results
must be interpreted as a warning about the total generality of
the subject-object-verb recall order reported in earlier

7

studies.

Wearing (1973) found that verbs were the poorest recalled,
of all parts of speech, for sentences of 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13
words; this inferiority was most marked for sentences longer than
7 words. Wearing suggested that when the span of memory is
exceeded, subjects recode the verb into a more abstract form
(perhaps as a set of markers or components relating the subject
and object) while subjects store the subject and object more
directly (perhaps as images). Reid (1974) likewise argued that
the verb has no direct representation in memory. This view is in
sharp contrast to Chafe (1970) who argued that noun meaning is
determined by verb characteristics,

Thios (1975) offered an explanation similar to Wearing's to
explain his finding that verbs were poorer recall cues than
subjects; he noted that when verb synonyms were allowed as
correct responses, these synonyms were much more common for
general ("made") rather than specific ("carved") verbs. Thios
suggested that fewer noun attributes were specified by general
verbs, therefore less information was extracted. As a result,
subjects were more likely to generate synonyms at recall time.
Gomulicki (1956), dealing with connected prose passages, also
found verbs to be recalled poorer than nouns; this pattern was
reversed when synonyms were allowed as correct answers.

A theoretical explanation similar to Wearing's has been

advanced by Begg and Paivio (1969). Begg and Paivio have argued,
at least with respect to concrete material, that subjects form a
mental picture (i.e., image) of the scene depicted in the
sentence. This implies a natural ordering for form classes, with
respect to recall (and probably recognition): "Recall of
sentence nouns merely requires labeling the pictorial objects,
recalling adjectives requires that the subject describe the
objects, recalling verbs requires labeling of an inferred action
in which the objects are engaged, and recalling adverbs requires
description of that action. Thus, there should be more semantic
distortion in recall of sentences in order from nouns to
adverbs" (Begg & Paivio, 1969, p. 826). The prediction for
abstract material is less clear, but such an ordering may not
exist as the sentence components seem to be more closely tied to
the surface structure ordering.

However, another argument could be offered to explain why
some cues are more effective than others. This argument is
based on the importance of an item to the semantic structure of a
sentence. Items that are of the most importance are processed
to a "deeper" or more "meaningful" level than less important
items. The nature of this semantic structure is unspecified at
present, but Rumelhart, Lindsay, and Norman (1972), Kintsch
(1972), and others have made some suggestions about the nature of
this semantic memory. The idea that certain elements receive
more processing than others is in agreement with the position of

Gomulicki (1956) who argued that various parts of a passage are

actively, and perhaps unwittingly, selected by subjects for

differential analysis by a process he called mnemic abstraction.

This idea of different levels of processing is similar to that

recently presented by Craik and Lockhart (1972).

Fillenbaum (1970) has tried to explain the apparent

paradoxical findings about the role of verbs in sentences by

suggesting that "it is quite possible that the way in which a

sentence is analyzed and stored in a memorial task . . . may be

quite different in important respects from the way in which it is

processed in a task which requires full understanding of the

sentence". In support of this contention, Anderson and Hidde

(1971), in an incidental learning task where a subject was the

cue for verb and object recall, found no superiority in recall of

object nouns. Wearing (1974), dubbing this problem "Fillenbaum's

paradox", noted that memory tasks should tap underlying meaning

and similarity judgment tasks should do the same. Wearing

suggested that the source of the paradox may lie in radically

different sentential materials being used in the two types of

tasks. To circumvent this possible confound, Wearing used a

common set of sentences in both a semantic sorting task and a

free recall memory task; the words (subject, verb, object) varied

on Osgoodian Potency. Wearing's sorting results replicated Healy

and Miller (1970); 77% of the subjects sorted principally on the

basis of the verb; there were no differences due to Potency of

the words. In the recall task, for low Potency sentences, there
was no difference for recallibility of subjects, verbs, and
objects; for high Potency sentences, verbs were poorest recalled.
Wearing suggested that the functional significance of the verb in
sentences changes in the course of sentence processing since the
memory task required the reconstruction of the sentence minutes
after presentation while the judgment task imposed no memory
load. This explanation, of course, is similar to that advanced
earlier by Wearing (1973) and Fillenbaum (1970). Wearing further
proposed that if the value of the verb, in its surface structure
form does change over the time course of the memory experiment,
it might be wise to examine immediate memory, i.e., at the point
of comprehension: here, verb-noun differences should be erased,
or even reversed. In fact, Wearing (1971), using a divided
attention technique, found verb recall to be superior to noun
recall.

Three main theoretical explanations for the inferiority of
verbs in memorial tasks may be abstracted from the above
speculations. One we may call the "Verb Decomposition Model";
this is exemplified by Wearing's suggestion that the verb
changes form over the course of the memory task; Begg and
Paivio's imagery model may be viewed as a paraphrase of Wearing's
approach. Second, Gomulicki's and Craik's and Lockhart's
approaches could be called the "Levels of Processing Model" or
alternatively, the "Semantic Encoding Model"; this is similar to

the first model with the exception that the changes in storage

of the verb occur not over time but at the point of

comprehension. Finally, Fillenbaum's "Task Demand Model" states

that the mere fact of intentional learning in a memory task

reduces the necessity of semantic analysis inherent in a sorting

or judgment task.

Nouns and verbs seem clearly to have special importance in

phrase and sentence memory. However, other elements may be

important candidates as efficient cues for recognition as well.

In addition, most of the studies underlying these three models

have used simple S-V-O sentences in the active voice as test

materials. Therefore, the present study will examine how the

relationship between nouns and verbs, and their modifiers in

phrases, may be affected in recognition by several factors such

as the voice of the sentence and the sentence's concreteness.

Hopefully, these data will help resolve Fillenbaum's paradox and

allow a choice among these three similar explanations of the

verb's role in sentence memory. Also, by replacing various words

in the recognition phrase with either synonyms or unrelated

words, we seek to gain a better understanding of how the

different components of a sentence are stored in memory,

Experiment 1

Method

Subjects. A total of 80 subjects participated in the study; 32 subjects served in the experiment proper, while 48 subjects helped generate stimulus sentences. All subjects were students in Introductory Psychology at Dartmouth College and served for course credit.

Design. The experiment used a recognition memory paradigm. Five sentences were presented in a block for the subject to study; after an interpolated activity (reciting the alphabet backwards), a phrase (either unchanged or altered) from one of the five sentences was presented; the subject's task was to signify if he had seen this target (test) phrase in the sample of five sentences.

The experiment involved a factorial design with two between-subjects factors and three repeated-measures factors. The two between-subjects factors were Concreteness (concrete or abstract sentences) and Voice (sentences were either active or passive). Eight subjects were tested in each of the four cells formed by these two factors. There were three repeated-measures factors: the Cue Phrase Presented could be either the subject phrase, verb phrase, or object phrase; the Part of Speech Changed could be either the modifier or head (noun or verb) in the phrase; the Type of Change could be a change to a synonym or to an unrelated

13

word.

Materials. All sentences had the general form Article,

Adjective, Noun, Adverb, Verb, Article, Adjective, Noun (e.g.,

The deep anger quickly caused the noisy outburst). All

sentences were reversible, that is the subject and object

phrases could be interchanged without creating a nonsense

sentence. The experimenters and an assistant each examined a

large pool of possible test sentences generated by subjects, and

discarded any that were anomalous. Of the remaining sentences

those which all three people agreed contained nouns and verbs

with physical referents were classified as concrete. Those with

no physical referents were classified as abstract. After the

concrete and abstract sentences of the above form had been

chosen, every other sentence had the subject and object phrases

interchanged to avoid any possible bias in sentence construction.

Each sentence was then transformed into the passive form and

checked for meaningfulness. From this pool, 48 concrete and 48

abstract sentences were chosen. Altered versions of 24 of the 48

test sentences for each kind (concrete and abstract) were

constructed in the following manner. Eight alternates had a

change performed in the subject phrase, eight in the verb phrase,

and eight in the object phrase (Cue Phrase Presented factor).

Within each group of eight alternate sentences, four had the

modifier (adjective or adverb) changed, and four had the head

(noun or verb) changed (Part of Speech Changed factor). Within

each of these four sentences, two of the changes involved
replacement by synonyms; the other two changes involved
extraneous (neither synonymous nor antonymous) words. All
replacement words were matched to the original words as closely
as possible on Thorndike-Lorge frequency. Filler sentences for
each presentation block had the same grammatical form and number
of words as the 24 critical sentences. No filler sentence was
used more than once. These filler sentences were selected such
that they shared no words other than articles with each other or
with the target sentences.

Procedure. Testing of subjects took place at a computer
terminal connected to the Dartmouth Time-Sharing System; after a
subject was seated at the terminal and had read the instructions,
a block of five sentences was presented. One of these five was
the target sentence four were fillers. A block was exposed for
20 sec after which the subject was presented with a randomly
selected letter of the alphabet. The subject was instructed to
say the alphabet backwards from this startpoint. After 5 sec of
alphabet pronunciation, the subject was presented with a cue
phrase which   may or   may not have appeared in one
of the sentences in the preceding block of five. Half the time,
the cue phrase was identical to a phrase presented in one of the
preceding five sentences; half the time, the phrase had been
altered in some manner. For each subject, different patterns of
old and changed phrases were generated; that is, the specific

sentences used as sources for test phrases were counterbalanced
across subjects. After the cue phrase was presented, the subject
was asked to decide whether he had seen this phrase in the
preceding five sentences (old/new judgment).

Results and Discussion

OLD Cue Phrases. The d' measure or signal detectability was
used to correct for guessing or response bias. Each subject's
proportion correct (when the cue phrase was OLD)·and proportion
incorrect (when the cue phrase was NEW) for all NEW phrases,
were converted to average d' scores. Each subject obtained three
d' scores, one for each of the three levels of the repeated-
measures factor in this analysis (Cue Phrase Presented). The
other two factors included in the analysis were Concreteness and
Voice of the sentences. There were two significant effects in
this analysis. Concrete cue phrases were more easily detectable
as OLD (.70) than abstract cue phrases (.59, F = 26.77, df =
1/28, p < .001, MSe = .62). As well, the two noun phrases
(subject phrase and object phrase) were more often detected
correctly as OLD than the verb phrase (F = 5.99, df = 2/56, p <
.005, MSe = .66). In analysis of simple proportions correct,
uncorrected for guessing, both of the above effects narrowly
missed standard significance levels (p = .077 and p = .064). For
the Cue Phrase Presented effect, the mean proportions correct
were .64 (subject), .58 (verb), and .68 (object). The failure to

obtain a significant effect for <u>Voice</u> is mildly surprising but is in agreement with the results of Wearing (1970).

<u>NEW Cue Phrases</u>. The proportions correct for judging NEW phrases were analyzed in a five-way analysis of variance, where the factors were <u>Voice</u>, <u>Concreteness</u>, <u>Cue Phrase Presented</u>, <u>Part of Speech Changed</u>, and <u>Type of Change</u>.

In addition to significant main effects for <u>Concreteness</u> and <u>Type of Change</u>, there were several significant interactions. The means for the significant interaction of <u>Type of Change</u> by <u>Cue Phrase Presented</u> are presented in Table 1. (F = 8.66, <u>df</u> = 2/56, p <.001, MSe = .07). Two things are evident from this interaction. First, the fact that synonyms function as more effective distractors (see above) is seen here. Also, the relative effectiveness of using subject phrases, verb phrases, or object phrases as distractors is highlighted. Verb phrases where a synonym distractor is present pose the greatest problem to the subjects. A Scheffe test comparing the verb phrase to the noun phrases in the synonym condition was significant (F = 4.71, <u>df</u> = 2/56, p < .02, MSe = .065).

Insert Table 1 about here

The means for the significant (F = 4.87, <u>df</u> = 2/56, p <.02, MSe = .06) interaction of <u>Part of Speech Changed</u> by <u>Cue Phrase</u>

<u>Presented</u> presented in Table 2 suggests that the source of this

confusion with verb phrases lies with the verb itself. We can

tentatively conclude that the strongest source of recognition

errors lies with verb synonym distractors.

                    Insert Table 2 about here

This finding raises an interesting possibility. It is usually

accepted that the reason for the effectiveness of synonyms as

distractors is that long-term memory is organized semantically

and that a synonym distractor in a recognition task confuses the

subject since he cannot differentiate it from his stored

conception of the presented word. It may be that verbs are

analyzed, comprehended, or stored differently from nouns (and

other words) in sentence learning experiments.

     If verbs are stored with more representation of the

semantic structure present, then the results of Wearing (1970)

are more readily interpretable. If verbs are primarily

remembered by semantic structure, they <u>should</u> be less useful as

retrieval cues (for surface structure) and also be more poorly

recalled (verbatim). In fact, both our intuitive feelings for

the central importance of verbs in sentences and the importance

stressed by theorists such as Chafe (1970) are supported by this

kind of conception of the processing of verbs in comprehension

and learning.

The recognition accuracy data may be rescored by treating
each instance that a synonym distractor was falsely called OLD as
a correct answer. If these data are averaged in with the
correct recognition scores for truly OLD sentences, the
probability of recognition of verb phrases is now .51, while that
of subject and object phrases is .45 and .48, respectively. It
is recognized that these are small differences and that Exp. 1
was not designed to test this effect. However, with respect to
the values given above, the potency of the verb phrases as a cue
has moved from last-place to being at least equal to the noun
phrases.

Another interesting finding is that despite the strong
difference between synonym and unrelated word changes, we failed
to find an interaction between this factor and Concreteness as
reported by Begg and Paivio (1969). Since there was a
significant four-way interaction involving Concreteness, Cue
Phrase Presented, Part of Speech Changed, and Type of Change (F =
5.18, df = 2/56, p < .009, MSe = .07), by collapsing across the
appropriate factors, we can obtain results that may be compared
to those of Begg and Paivio (Table 3).

Insert Table 3 about here

It appears from examination of Table 3 that subjects recognize
not only meaning-altering changes but also meaning-preserving

changes better for concrete material than for abstract material.
This is just the reverse of the Begg and Paivio finding and will
be discussed further below.

The results from this first experiment are far from being
conclusive. With respect to the main question of what serves as
the most easily recognized cue, the answer seems to be closely
tied to how one scores the data. With a strict verbatim scoring
procedure, nouns appear to be best, but if synonyms are accepted
as correct, this advantage disappears. This finding is
suggestive with respect to our second question of why one word
may act as a better cue than others and how this is related to
its form of storage. Perhaps verbs are processed to a
semantically "deeper" level (in the generative semantic sense)
and are therefore more easily confused with synonyms. As well,
this offers a possible explanation as to why verbs are poorer
cues for surface structure than nouns. Exp. 2 uses a forced-
choice recognition paradigm to more rigorously test this
question.

Experiment 2

Method

Subjects. Twenty-four students from Introductory Psychology
participated in the main experiment.

Design. This experiment used a forced-choice recognition memory

paradigm where there were three possible answers presented at
test time; these three answers included a phrase which actually
had been presented in a preceding block of five sentences, a
phrase where a verb (or noun) had been replaced by a synonym, or
a phrase where a verb (or noun) had been replaced by a different
word, thus changing the meaning of the phrase. All
manipulations used repeated measures factors. These included
concreteness (concrete and abstract sentences); nature of the cue
phrase presented (subject phrase, verb phrase, or object phrase),
and type of distractor (synonym or unrelated word).

Materials. The 24 critical sentences used were the same ones
used in Exp. 1. However, half of the altered sentences used in
Exp. 1 had only synonym distractors available and the other half
only unrelated words. Therefore, 12 new verb and noun synonyms
and 12 unrelated verb and noun distractors were generated by the
experimenters. These words were matched as closely as possible
to the Thorndike-Lorge counts of the words for which they were
substituted.

There exists the possibility that the effects noted in Exp.
1 are purely artifactual. In our choice of synonyms for nouns
and verbs, we may have inadvertently picked verb synonyms which
were closer in meaning to presented verbs than the noun synonym
distractors were to the presented nouns. A brief rating
experiment was performed to exclude this as an explanation.
Eighteen volunteers from Introductory Psychology served as

subjects. Each subject received a test booklet which contained
all 24 sets of word-synonym sets and also all 24 sets of
unrelated word sets chosen for Exp. 2. Each subject rated the
similarity in meaning of each presented word pair on a scale
ranging from 1 (identical meaning) to 7 (completely different
meaning). The possibility that the observed difference between
synonym noun and verb substitution reported earlier is due to an
artifact of material construction may be ruled out, because noun
and verb synonyms were given almost the same mean rating (2.4 and
2.34, respectively, n.s.).

Procedure. Testing took place in a group setting. Blocks of
five sentences were presented visually for 20 sec of study; after
10 sec of an interpolated task involving crossing out letters,
the subjects saw three phrases (same, synonym, unrelated) and
recorded their judgment of which one they had actually seen in an
answer booklet. Twenty-four trials were given.

Results and Discussion

Overall Accuracy. There was only one significant effect
when overall level of accuracy of picking the correct
alternative was scored. Concrete phrases were more often
correctly identified (.81) than abstract phrases (.58) ($F =$
30.85, $df = 1/20$, $p < .001$, MSe = .05).

Error Analysis. The frequency of false recognitions was
analyzed in a 2 x 2 x 2 design, where the factors were

Concreteness, Word Type (noun or verb), and Distractor Type
(synonym or unrelated). The significant interaction between
Word Type and Distractor Type ($F = 5.01$, $df = 1/20$, $p = .03$)
clearly shows that synonym distractors are much more powerful for
verbs than for nouns (see Table 4).

Insert Table 4 about here

To return to the issue of the concreteness of the materials
and its effect on recognition memory: our failure to replicate
Begg and Paivio's (1969) finding in either Experiments 1 or 2 may
be due to the differences in paradigm. Begg and Paivio presented
their material verbally rather than visually and on recognition
trials, presented the whole sentence rather than just a cue
phrase. Also, their method of changing a sentence's meaning was
slightly different from ours: They interchanged the subject and
object, while we substituted an unrelated word. If
methodological variations are the cause of the lack of
replication, then their finding is of only limited interest due
to its lack of generality. The second possibility is that the
distinction between concrete and abstract material is not
qualitative, as is implied by Begg and Paivio's distinction in
storage mechanism, but is rather due to some other factor(s), such
as ease of comprehension. Thus, if both concrete and abstract
material are handled by a single type of process, this could

account for our finding that although nouns and verbs differ in
recognizability, the same relationship between the two holds for
both concrete and abstract material.

Supporting evidence for a single mode of processing comes
from a study by Tieman (1971). Tieman used comparative
sentences of the form "The garage is newer than the theater" and
manipulated the instructions given the subjects and the
concreteness of the sentences. The subjects were instructed to
try to remember the exact wording, the "gist" (i.e.,meaning), or
to form an image of the sentence referent and remember the image.
A multiple-choice recognition test was used where two of the
distractors were generated by interchanging subject and object
nouns and replacing the comparative adjective by its opposite
(e.g., older for newer). The amount of semantic confusion was
the same over levels of concreteness, and the concreteness-
abstractness of the adjectives did not interact with the
instruction variable. This is in line with our findings from
Experiments 1 and 2.

Johnson, Bransford, Nyberg, and Cleary (1972) have
criticized Begg's and Paivio's study on several grounds: (1)
Their concrete sentences were more easily comprehended than the
abstract sentences, and (2) their test changes differentially
affected the meaning of concrete as compared to abstract
sentences. These two criticisms are also valid with respect to
our stimulus material. The differential effect of our test

Change is indicated by the main effect for concreteness reported
earlier; as well, on an intuitive level, our concrete sentences
seem to be more easily comprehended than our abstract sentences.
Nonetheless, the result remains that there was no significant
interaction between the concreteness of the materials and the
type of change (meaning-preserving or meaning-altering) used in
the distractors.

For both concrete and abstract sentences at a strictly
verbatim (i.e., surface structure) level, it does appear that
noun changes are more easily detected than verb changes.
However, this effect may not be due to the noun playing the key
role in sentence comprehension and storage; rather, it may be
because the noun receives less semantic processing than verbs.
This is indicated by the fact that verbs are more confused with
words similar in meaning than nouns, as hinted at in Exp. 1 and
clearly demonstrated in Exp. 2. As well, it was found that this
differential effect was not an artifact of the stimulus material
used. Rather, it seems that in the processing of sentences,
subjects actively analyze verbs to a deeper semantic level than
nouns.

Experiment 3

The finding that subjects appear to differentially process
nouns and verbs leads one to question whether this is the result

of a natural tendency on subjects' part or if it may reflect
some general characteristics of the language. It is possible
that within the language itself there exists some constraint
which causes this observed difference. For example, the corpus
of verbs available to describe any given action may have a
higher overlap in meaning than the corresponding nouns. In order
to obtain some tentative information on this question, a brief
experiment was performed.

Method

Subjects. Thirty-two students from the same source as described
above acted as subjects.

Procedure. This study was conducted in two parts; during the
first stage, a number of photographs were taken of simple actor-
action-object scenes (e.g., a hammer hitting a nail). Ten of the
resulting slides that were judged least ambiguous were selected
and presented to a group of 12 subjects. These subjects were
instructed to generate two simple sentences of the form "The
subject verbed the object," both of which adequately described
the picture. They were also instructed that the two versions
were to have no words in common, other than the definite article.
These generated sentences were examined, and any instances where
the same word appeared in both sentences or the grammatical frame
was violated were discarded. From the pool of 91 remaining
sentence pairs, the noun and verb pairs for each set were.

extracted. The resulting word pairs were then randomized and divided into two halves. Each half was presented to a group of 10 subjects with the instructions to rate the similarity in meaning of each word pair on a scale ranging from 1 (identical meaning) to 7 (completely different meaning). During the stage of sentence generation, the slides were presented in a standard size classroom by means of a Kodak Carousel projector; subjects were given as much time as they needed to generate the two sentences, and in all instances, both sentences were generated in well under 2 min and usually in less than 1 min. During the second stage of the study, the extracted word pairs were presented in booklets for other subjects to rate. There were nine word pairs to a page and at assembly time, the page order for each booklet was scrambled. Subjects were allowed as much time as they needed for the rating task.

Results and Discussion.

Each subject's score for each picture-word pair combination was obtained, and these data were subjected to an analysis of variance. This analysis consisted of a 2 x 2 x 10 design, where the factors were Half (either the first or second half of the word pairs), Word Type (noun or verb), and Picture. The effect of major interest was that of Word Type, which was nonsignificant ($F = 4.11$, $df = 1/18$, $p > .05$, MSe = .84). The similarity rating for nouns was 3.33 and that for verbs 3.52. This is opposite of the possibility offered above and counter to any expectation

formed on the bases of results from Experiments 1 and 2. When
noun synonym pairs and verb synonym pairs are presented in
isolation, subjects tend to judge the nouns as being more similar
in meaning than the verbs. However, as Experiments 1 and 2
demonstrated, when verb synonym distractors are presented in a
sentence or phrase context, the reverse effect obtains.

Even though there was no difference between noun synonym
pairs and verb synonym pairs on degree of rated similarity, there
may still exist other important differences between the nouns and
verbs generated by subjects. For example, the corpus of verbs
available to describe some situations may have more commonality
than nouns; there may not be as many available. Two analyses
were performed to test this possibility. For each of the 10
slides, the number of different words (types) used to describe
each of the three components of the situation (subject noun,
verb, object noun) was computed. The sum across 10 slides was
62 for subject nouns, 68 for verbs, and 64 for object nouns. The
second analysis examined the two most commonly used words for
each of the three sentence positions. Summed across 10 slides,
the two most commonly used words accounted for 62.5% of the
words generated (tokens) for subject nouns, 62.3% for verbs, and
66.7% for object nouns.

It is clear from these two analyses that the verbs and
nouns do not differ in the relative commonality of word choices.

Experiment 4

This study is a partial replication of Exp. 2 and was
designed to insure greater orthographic and derivational
similarity between noun and verb pairs. This study used noun and
verb pairs which were derivationally-related, that is, the stem
of nouns and verbs were similar.

Method

Subjects. A total of 60 subjects participated in the study; 24
subjects served in the experiment proper, while 36 subjects
helped generate filler sentences and rated semantic similarity of
verb-verb and noun-noun pairs. All subjects were students in
Introductory Psychology at Dartmouth College and served for
course credit.

Design. The experiment used a recognition memory paradigm where
seven sentences were presented in a block for a subject to
study; after an interpolated activity (counting numbers backwards
by threes), a sentence from the block of seven was presented to
the subject, who had to signify if he had seen this sentence in
the sample of seven sentences presented earlier. The experiment
involved a factorial design with two repeated-measures factors;
these factors were Part of Speech Changed (either the subject
noun, or the verb) and Type of Change (a change to a synonym or

to an unrelated word). One third of the the test sentences
presented were identical to a critical sentence presented in the
block of seven sentences earlier, while two-thirds of the test
sentences involved a change in either the subject noun or the
verb.

Materials. All sentences had the general form: Article, Noun,
Verb, Article, Adjective, Noun (e.g., The author cashed the
large check). All sentences were relatively concrete, that is,
the verbs and nouns in each sentence referred to a physical
referent.

The experimenters generated a large number of word pairs
whose stems could form the base of either verbs or nouns because
of their derivational similarity; an example of such a pair would
be sprinted-raced and sprinter-racer. Twenty-four subjects made
counterbalanced semantic similarity judgments on the pairs of
words; half the pairs were in the verb form and half in the noun
form. From the initial pairs 12 were selected which satisfied
the double criteria of having similarity judgments above the
neutral point (i.e., above four on a 7-point scale) and a good
match on similarity judgments for the noun and verb forms. Table
5 presents the 12 pairs of words as well as the unrelated words
used in each sentence, along with the mean synonymity judgments.

Insert Table 5 about here

30

Procedure.   Testing of subjects took place at a computer terminal

connected to the Dartmouth Time-Sharing System; after the subject

was seated at the terminal and had read the instructions, a block

of seven sentences was presented.   One of these seven was a

target sentence; six were fillers.   The fillers shared no words

(other than articles) with each other or with the target

sentence.   This block was exposed for 30 sec, after which the

subject was presented with a three-digit number and instructed to

count backwards by threes for 10 sec.   At this time, the subject

was presented with a test sentence which may or may not have been

identical to one of the sentences in the preceding block of

seven.   Half the time, the sentence presented was identical to

one of the sentences presented earlier; half the time either the

subject noun or the verb had been altered in some manner.

     After the test sentence was presented, the subject was asked

to decide whether he had seen this sentence in the preceding

block of seven sentences (old-new judgment).

Results and Discussion

OLD Cue Phrases.   The mean proportion correct for

recognizing OLD sentences was .80; thus subjects were reasonably

accurate in recognizing truly old or unchanged sentences.

NEW Cue Phrases.   The proportions wrong for judging NEW

sentences were analyzed in a two-way analysis of variance where

the two factors were Part of Speech Changed and Type of Change.

In addition to two highly significant main effects, there
was a significant interaction between the two factors (F = 6.24,
df = 1/23, p = .02, MSe = .07).

Insert Table 6 about here

Table 6 presents the mean proportions wrong for recognition of
new sentences; as can be seen from the table, verb synonyms
function as much more effective distractors than noun synonyms.
This effect has been seen previously in Experiments 1 and 2, but
here, where there is more adequate control of orthographic and
derivational similarity between nouns and verbs, the effect is
even more striking. For different word distractors nouns and
verbs are equal in judged oldness. However, noun synonyms are
incorrectly judged old only about 13% of the time, while those
test sentences containing verb synonyms are incorrectly judged
old almost 40% of the time.

Experiment 5

The tentative explanation which was offered for the results
of Experiments 1, 2, and 4 was that verbs, when encoded, retain
more semantic information than nouns. This structural difference
in memory encoding between verbs and nouns is postulated to cause

the high degree of false recognition of verb synonyms in a later
recognition test. However, there is a highly plausible
alternative explanation for the obtained data. It may be that
nouns and verbs are processed to equivalent semantic levels, and
are encoded to a similar depth; however, for nouns more surface
structure or orthographic information is retained. This
alternative explanation would suggest that when a synonym
distractor is presented at test time, the memory representation
for nouns would have two components: semantic information and
orthographic or feature information. Verbs, on the other hand,
are remembered only in respect to semantic components. If this
is the case, then the obtained data which show a high degree of
false recognition for verb synonyms is due not to the fact that
verbs are processed to a deeper semantic level but rather verbs
and nouns are processed to equivalent semantic levels but a
secondary source of information is retained for nouns. This
means that when a noun synonym is presented as a distractor. a
subject is less likely to "recognize" this noun synonym as being
old because, in fact, he has two sources of information to tell
him that this noun synonym distractor is, in fact, new. Thus the
obtained differences between verb and noun synonym distractors
may be due to the fact that subjects are simply more accurate for
noun synonym distractors because they have more information
available to them.

This alternative explanation offers one clear prediction in

terms of the amount of semantic information available to subjects
for verbs and nouns. If this alternative explanation is true
then verbs and nouns are encoded in a similar semantic fashion
and a rating task performed immediately after the presentation of
sentences should show verb and noun synonymity ratings to be
equal. Exp. 5 was designed to test whether subjects perceive
sentences with verb and noun synonym distractors as being equally
synonymous with sentences presented in the acquisition phase of
the experiment.

Method

With two exceptions, the materials and general procedure in
this study were identical to those of Exp. 4. During the test
phase of the experiment subjects were asked to rate the degree of
semantic similarity of the presented test sentence to the
corresponding sentence which had been presented in the earlier
block of seven sentences instead of making an old-new judgment as
in Exp. 4. As well, there was no interpolated activity between
the block of seven sentences and the test phase. Twenty-four
subjects from Introductory Psychology participated in the study.

Results and Discussion

The main dependent variable of interest is judgment of
similarity of sentences on a 1 to 7 scale where seven means
identical semantic content or total synonymity. For the 12 truly
old sentences which each subject saw, the mean similarity rating

34

was 6.05. On the other hand, for the six instances where
unrelated words were substituted the mean similarity rating was
3.0 for verbs and 2.88 for nouns (n.s.). When test sentences
involving synonyms were presented, the mean similarity rating for
verbs was 5.52 and for nouns 4.68 (t = 2.62, df = 23, p < .008,
sed = .32). These data are in sharp contrast to the mean
similarity ratings for these pairs obtained in isolation (outside
of sentences) in Exp. 4; those mean synonymity ratings were 5.40
for verb synonym pairs and 5.35 for noun synonym pairs.

The results of this study demonstrate clearly that, as far
as subjective impressions of semantic similarity are concerned,
test sentences containing verb synonyms are more closely related
semantically, than test sentences involving noun synonyms. This
is in direct contradiction to the prediction stated above, which
maintained that noun synonyms and verb synonyms should contain
equivalent amounts of semantic information.

General Discussion

As was pointed out in the Introduction, several theoretical
trends point to the verb's importance in the sentence. This view
is corroborated by rating and sorting experiments (e.g. Healy
and Miller, 1970) and by processing tasks that directly
manipulate verb characteristics (e.g. Rohrman, 1970).

A problem arises in reconciling these facts with the
general inferiority of verbs in memorial tasks (e.g. James, 1972;
Wearing, 1970, 1973); Wearing (1974) has called this problem
"Fillenbaum's paradox".

It was proposed that three classes of models exist as
explanations of Fillenbaum's paradox. The "Verb Decomposition
Model" is clearly wrong. Experiments 1 and 2 showed that verbs
were stored with more semantic content than nouns, as indicated
by the higher false positive response rate to synonym
distractors. Since this effect was noted with isolated verb
phrases, rather than for intact sentences, the nouns could not be
acting as repositories of meaning for "decomposed" verbs. It
might be worthwhile to note here that Quasi-F analyses (Clark,
1973) were performed where appropriate throughout the analyses in
the present experiments and failed to alter any of the
conclusions reached through conventional analyses. Hence the
present results may be generalized over both sentences and
subjects.

The "Task Demand Model" also appears to be wrong. The
results of Experiments 1, 2, 4, and especially Exp. 5 indicate
that the verbs in presented sentences do not receive less
semantic analysis at presentation time. If anything, they seem
to receive more semantic analysis, as indicated by the high
synonymity ratings given in Exp. 5.

This leaves us with some version of the "Semantic Encoding Model". It appears that Wearing's (1974) speculation was partially correct; verbs do change storage form in the course of the memory task, and they do lose some surface structure representation. For purpose of analysis, we can imagine two main components in the memory storage of individual words--semantic information and form information (orthographic or phonological features). It may be that verbs and nouns retain equal amounts of semantic information or are processed to equal semantic levels, but nouns retain more form information. This would explain the high false positive rate for synonyms but is directly contradicted by the rating data of Exp. 5.

Another possibility is that verbs are processed to a deeper semantic level but nouns and verbs retain equivalent amounts of form information. This pattern would nicely explain the present pattern of results but is totally incompatible with the variety of earlier studies on recognition and recall of verbs and nouns.

We are forced to conclude that a complex processing interaction occurs at comprehension time. Verbs are processed to a deeper semantic level and nouns have the form information encoded more strongly. In Craik's and Lockhart's (1972) terms, verbs undergo a more extensive Type 2 analysis, while nouns receive an extended Type 1 analysis. These two independent foci of analysis will yield differential storage strengths for the two word classes. It is important to note that both of these

differential analyses must be hypothesized in order to explain

both the present pattern of results and those of earlier memorial

studies.

   While an application of "Levels of Processing" has been

demonstrated clearly by Graesser and Mandler (1975), for surface

and idea structure of entire sentences, only Gomulicki (1956)

appears to have offered an intra-sentence example. In fact, the

essential elements of the "Semantic Encoding Model" were proposed

20 years ago by Gomulicki. He noted : "... the abstractive

process seems to develop concurrently with the process of

understanding a passage while hearing it [and] the selectivity of

mnemic abstraction implies an unwitting ranking of parts

according to importance"(p. 90). He went on to suggest that

"...attention fluctuates during the hearing of a passage,

certain parts drawing 'maximum attention' at the expense of

others ..."(p. 90).

   The "Semantic Encoding Model" nicely explains the present

pattern of results and most of the data on verb and noun recall

in the literature. However, three studies where the results seem

incompatible with the model must be examined in more detail.

   The most troublesome data to explain is that of Thios

(1975). He found that subject nouns were better cues for

sentence recall than either verbs or object nouns which did not

differ from each other in effectiveness. This argues that there

was no differential storage for verbs and object nouns. However,
several facets of the analysis prevent easy comparisons. First,
the dependent measure was proportion of complete sentence
recalls. Thus, subject nouns were acting as cues for verbs and
object nouns, verbs were acting as cues for two nouns, and object
nouns were acting as cues for a verb and the subject noun. The
form of storage of the verb is difficult to determine with this
complex set of interrelations. Second, Thios found that, when
verb synonym responses were allowed as correct answers, that
"general" sentences were more affected by this more liberal
scoring criterion than were sentences with "specific" verbs.
However, this is probably artifactual since general verbs, almost
by definition, have more synonyms available.

Wearing (1971) reported, in a divided attention task with
immediate recall, that recall of verbs was superior to that of
nouns. First, only one statistical test of verb-noun recall (out
of three possible) was reported. As well, the failure of recall
of nouns due to high levels of within-sentence interference is a
real possibility; this possibility is further complicated by a
strong serial position effect noted by Wearing. Lastly, it is
difficult, if not impossible, to judge the nature of the memory
storage for the elements of these sentences because of the
possibility of a variety of recall cues (phonological, semantic,
etc.) being available in the immediate test paradigm.

The last study to be examined is that of Wearing (1974) who

found no difference in verb-noun recall in low Potency sentences
but a significant decrement for high Potency verbs. On the
surface, it is difficult to see how the "Semantic Encoding Model"
would predict this differential effect. However, if high Potency
verbs are more important to a sentence, they will be analyzed to
a deeper semantic level, and will come out poorly on a verbatim
test of recall; this is predictable from the "Semantic Encoding
Model".

A second model may be proposed which is conceptually similar
to the "Semantic Encoding Model." It may be that verbs and nouns
are processed to equivalent semantic and form levels but that
differential decay of the word attributes occurs for some other
reasons. These may be related to interfering effects of other
stimulus materials, the mere passage of time, etc. A series of
experiments is currently underway in an attempt to separate these
two similar explanations.

The theatrical metaphor of Healy and Miller (1970) appears
still to be well-chosen and is supported by the present series of
experiments. The plot is subjected to a deeper "semantic"
analysis by both audiences and theater critics; classic plays
become immortal because of the timelessness of their message
rather than the crude mechanics of their entrances, exits, and
scene-lengths, all of which seem soon forgotten. Actors, on the
other hand, serve as interpreters of a plot; their effectiveness
and fame rests on more immediate stylistic devices. Although

they too have a "semantic level", it is either not comprehended

or else quickly forgotten.

References

Anderson, R. C., & Hidde, J. L. Imagery and sentence learning. _Journal of Educational Psychology_, 1971, 62(6), 526-530.

Bacharach, V. R., Kellas, G. & McFarland, C. E. Structural properties of transitive and intransitive verbs. _Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior_, 1972, 11, 486-490.

Begg, I. & Paivio, A. U. Imagery and sentence meaning. _Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior_, 1969, 8(6), 821-827.

Blumenthal, A. L. Prompted recall of sentences. _Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior_, 1967, 6, 203-206.

Bower, G. H. Imagery as a relational organizer in associative learning. _Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior_, 1970, 9, 529-533.

Chafe, W. _Meaning and the structure of language_. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Clark, H.H. The language-as-fixed-effect fallacy: A critique of language statistics in psychological research. _Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior_, 1973, 12, 335-359.

Craik, F. I. M., & Lockhart, R. S. Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. _Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior_, 1972, 11, 621-684.

Fillenbaum, S. On the use of memorial techniques to assess syntactic structures. _Psychological Bulletin_, 1970, 73, 231-237.

Fodor, J. A., Garrett, M., & Bever, T. G. Some syntactic

determinants of sentential complexity, II: Verb structure.

Perception and Psychophysics, 1968, 3, 453-461.

Gladney, T. A. & Krulee, G. K. The influence of syntactic errors
on sentence recognition. Journal of Verbal Learning and
Verbal Behavior, 1967, 6, 694-698.

Gollub, H. F. Impression formation and word combination in
sentences. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,
1968, 10, 341-353.

Gomulicki, B. R. Recall as an abstractive process. Acta
Psychologica, 1956, 12, 77-94.

Graesser, A. & Mandler, G. Recognition memory for the meaning
and surface structure of sentences. Journal of
Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory, 1975,
104, 238-248.

Healy, A. F. & Miller, G. A. The verb as the main determinant of
.sentence meaning. Psychonomic Science, 1970, 20, 372.

Healy, A. F. & Miller, G. A. The relative contribution of nouns
and verbs to sentence acceptability and comprehensibility.
Psychonomic Science, 1971, 24, 94-96.

Heise, D. R. Affectual dynamics in simple sentences. Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 11, 204-213.

Heise, D. R. Potency dynamics in simple sentences. Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16, 48-54.

Horowitz, L. M. & Prytulak, L. S. Redintegrative memory.
Psychological Review, 1969, 76, 519-531.

James, C. T. Theme and imagery in the recall of active and

passive sentences. <u>Journal</u> <u>of</u> <u>Verbal</u> <u>Learning</u> <u>and</u> <u>Verbal</u>
   <u>Behavior</u>, 1972, 11, 205-211.

Jarvella, R. J. Syntactic processing of connected speech.
   <u>Journal</u> <u>of</u> <u>Verbal</u> <u>Learning</u> <u>and</u> <u>Verbal</u> <u>Behavior</u>, 1971, 10,
   409-416.

Johnson, M. K., Bransford, J. D., Nyberg, S. F. & Cleary, J. J.
   Comprehension factors in interpreting memory for abstract
   and concrete sentences. <u>Journal</u> <u>of</u> <u>Verbal</u> <u>Learning</u> <u>and</u>
   <u>Verbal</u> <u>Behavior</u>, 1972, 11, 451-454.

Kintsch, W. Notes on the structure of semantic memory. In
   Tulving, E. & Donaldson, W. (eds.) <u>Organization</u> <u>of</u> <u>Memory</u>.
   New York: Academic, 1972.

Kintsch, W. <u>The</u> <u>Representation</u> <u>of</u> <u>Meaning</u> <u>in</u> <u>Memory</u>. New York;
   Wiley, 1974.

Martin, E. & Roberts, K. H. Grammatical factors in sentence
   retention. <u>Journal</u> <u>of</u> <u>Verbal</u> <u>Learning</u> <u>and</u> <u>Verbal</u> <u>Behavior</u>,
   1966, 5, 211-218.

Martin, E., Roberts, K. H. & Collins, A. M. Short-term memory
   for sentences. <u>Journal</u> <u>of</u> <u>Verbal</u> <u>Learning</u> <u>and</u> <u>Verbal</u>
   <u>Behavior</u>, 1968, 7 560-566.

Martin, E. & Walter, D. A. Subject uncertainty and word-class
   effects in short-term memory for sentences. <u>Journal</u> <u>of</u>
   <u>Experimental</u> <u>Psychology</u>, 1969, 80, 47-51.

Polzella, D. J. & Rohrman, N. L. Psychological aspects of
   transitive verbs. <u>Journal</u> <u>of</u> <u>Verbal</u> <u>Learning</u> <u>and</u> <u>Verbal</u>
   <u>Behavior</u>, 1970, 9, 537-540.

Reid, L. S.   Toward a grammar of the image.   Psychological

Bulletin, 1974, 81, 319-334.

Rohrman, N. L.   More on the recall of nominalizations.   Journal

of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1970, 9, 534-536.

Rumelhart, D. E., Lindsay, P. H. & Norman, D. A. A process model

for long-term memory.   In Tulving, E. & Donaldson, W.

(eds.) Organization of Memory.   New York: Academic, 1972.

Sachs, J. S.   Recognition memory for syntactic and semantic

aspects of connected discourse.   Perception and

Psychophysics, 1967, 2, 437-442.

Thios, S. J.   Memory for general and specific sentences. Memory

and Cognition, 1975, 3, 75-77.

Tieman, D. G.   Recognition memory for comparative sentences.

Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University,

1971. In J. R. Anderson and G. H. Bower, Human associative

memory. New York: Wiley, 1973.

Townsend, D. & Saltz, E.   Recall of sentences: Comparison of

phrase structure vs. core meaning theories.   Paper read to

the Midwestern Psychological Association, 1972.

Wearing, A. J.   The storage of complex sentences.   Journal of

Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1970, 9, 21-29.

Wearing, A. J.   Word class and serial position in the immediate

recall of sentences.   Psychonomic Science, 1971, 25, 338-

340.

Wearing, A. J.   Remembering complex sentences.   Quarterly Journal

of Experimental Psychology, 1972, 24, 77-86.

Wearing, A. J. The recall of sentences of varying length. _Australian Journal of Psychology_, 1973, 25, 155-161.

Wearing, A. J. Task differences and word-class effects in sentence processing. _Australian Journal of Psychology_, 1974, 26, 131-138.

Wearing, A. J. & Crowder, R. G. Dividing attention to study sentence acquisition. _Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior_, 1971, 10, 254-261.

Weisberg, R. Sentence processing assessed through intrasentence word associations. _Journal of Experimental Psychology_, 1969, 82, 332-338.

Yngve, V. H. A model and a hypothesis for language stucture. _Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society_, 1960, 104, 444-466.

Footnotes

Table 1. Means for interaction of <u>Cue Phrase Presented</u> by
<u>Type of Change</u>. Entries are mean proportions correct (NEW
phrases).

	<u>Type of Change</u>	
	<u>Synonym</u>	<u>Unrelated</u>
<u>Subject</u>	.74	.79
<u>Verb</u>	.56	.88
<u>Object</u>	.74	.86

Table 2. Mean proportions correct (NEW phrases) for
interaction of <u>Part of Speech Changed</u> by <u>Cue Phrase
Presented</u>.

| | Part of Speech Changed | |
	Modifier	Head
<u>Subject</u>	.79	.74
<u>Verb</u>	.74	.70
<u>Object</u>	.74	.86

Table 3. Proportion correct recognition of NEW phrases as a
function of <u>Concreteness</u>, <u>Type</u> <u>of</u> <u>Change</u> (synonym or
unrelated word), and <u>Part</u> <u>of</u> <u>Speech</u> <u>Changed</u> (verb or noun).

	<u>Nouns Changed</u>		<u>Verbs Changed</u>	
	<u>Synonym</u> <u>Distractor</u>	<u>Unrelated</u> <u>Distractor</u>	<u>Synonym</u> <u>Distractor</u>	<u>Unrelated</u> <u>Distractor</u>
<u>Concrete</u>	.83	.89	.66	.91
<u>Abstract</u>	.73	.67	.47	.76

Table 4. Mean proportion false recognition of NEW phrases
as a function of <u>Word Type</u> and <u>Distractor Type</u>.

	Distractor	
	<u>Synonym</u>	<u>Unrelated</u> <u>Word</u>
<u>Noun</u> <u>Phrase</u>	.19	.10
<u>Verb</u> <u>Phrase</u>	.27	.07

Table 5. Stimulus sentences used in Exp. 4. Words in parentheses are the synonym pair and different distractor. The number following the sentence is the mean similarity rating for the synonym pair (7=identical).

1(a). The janitor (washed/cleaned/broke) the dirty window. (5.45)

1(b). The (washing/cleaning/pumpkins) filled the whole basket. (5.31)

2(a). The woman (acted/performed/memorized) the difficult part. (4.77)

2(b). The (acting/performing/skating) required a night rehearsal. (4.50)

3(a). The child (punted/kicked/caught) the old football. (4.60)

3(b). The (punt/kick/lineman) saved the football game. (4.91)

4(a). The father (labored/worked/smoked) the whole period. (5.77)

4(b). The (laborer/worker/father) dropped the heavy stone. (5.80)

5(a). The athlete (sprinted/raced/dreaded) the last mile. (4.57)

5(b). The (sprinter/racer/soldier) completed the last mile. (4.20)

6(a). The corporation (transferred/moved/upset) the young executive. (5.09)

6(b). The (transfer/move/secretary) upset the young executive. (4.75)

7(a). The student (aided/helped/heard) the injured man. (6.45)

7(b). The (aid/help/studying) caused the final success. (6.32)

8(a). The millionaire (walked/strolled/reached) the long street. (5.35)

8(b). The (walk/stroll/spices) heightened the depressed appetite. (5.31)

9(a). The reporter (counselled/advised/interviewed) the innocent man. (5.70)

9(b). The (counsellor/adviser/reporter) interviewed the innocent man. (5.86)

10(a). The professor (taught/instructed/hated) the young student. (5.69)

10(b). The (teacher/instructor/mechanic) sought the best results. (5.90)

11(a). The teenager (authored/wrote/read) the lurid novel (5.51)

11(b). The (author/writer/teller) cashed the large check. (5.50)

12(a). The substitute (refereed/umpired/played) the close game. (5.90)

12(b). The (referee/umpire/announcer) called the close play. (5.57)

Table 6. Mean proportion wrong recognition of synonym and
unrelated distractors.

	Distractor Type	
	Synonym	Unrelated
Verbs	.396	.021
Nouns	.125	.021